

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated August 23, 2006 are respectfully requested. The applicants' representative wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough Office Action, particularly for the citations to relevant portions of the applied references. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly define subject matter for which applicants seek protection. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0006] or [0007] of the Specification.

#### **Personal Interview with Examiner**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for meeting with applicants' representatives Christopher Daley-Watson and Marcus Muller on January 23, 2007. In the interview, the applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Dourish. The applicants' representatives agreed to submit arguments in this Response similar to those discussed in the interview. Additionally, applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 11, 15, 17 and 18, and canceled claim 7 to alleviate the Examiner's concerns with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Should the Examiner require additional information regarding the substance of the interview, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative. As agreed upon, distinctions between the claims and the applied references are now discussed<sup>1</sup>.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,253,217 to Dourish et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

---

<sup>1</sup> Silence regarding a position taken by or argument made by the Examiner does not indicate any acquiescence to that position or argument. Furthermore, arguments made with respect to a particular claim or claims apply only to that claim or claims, and not to other claims, unless specifically noted herein.

### Embodiments of the Claimed Invention

Figure 1 of the Specification shows a computer system 100 with a profile storage location 108 and other storage location 110. A software application, such as Microsoft Word, creates a file. At some point, a profile that corresponds to that file may also be created. This profile contains, among other things, settings that are specific to the file and are used by the software application when a user is working with the file. For example, a user may elect an "autocorrect" setting within the software application when using the file. When the user is finished with the file, the system stores the file in one location and stores the profile in a separate location. In this example, the profile includes, among other things, information that the autocorrect setting was enabled. The next time the system retrieves the file, the system will also retrieve the corresponding profile from the separate storage location. Therefore, during a subsequent retrieval and use of the file, the autocorrect function will already be enabled, because the saved profile containing this setting will be retrieved along with the file (Specification, paragraph [0024]).

### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a computer system comprising

"a file, the file having an associated profile that specifies parameters associated with a previous instance of the file used by the software application for at least the purpose of preparing the software application to display the file upon its retrieval by the software application," and,

"a storage management module that distributes stored files and associated profiles among the plurality of storage media according to predetermined patterns, wherein at least one of the predetermined patterns includes storing a file separately from the file's associated profile."

Dourish does not discuss the separate storage of a file and a file's associated profile, as recited in the claim. Instead, Dourish discusses providing a property attachment

mechanism in a document management system that allows users to attach static and active properties to documents. The properties facilitate the storage of documents, as "documents are organized, stored and retrieved based on properties attached to documents by a user" (Column 7, lines 55-57). According to Dourish, properties may be "tags that can be placed on documents" (Column 9, lines 50-56).

The documents themselves may reside on different machines (such as kernels 18a-18n of Figure 3), and multiple copies of one document (each having different assigned properties) may reside in different kernels. However, there is no discussion of storing properties separately from associated documents.

Additionally, and possibly more importantly, there is no discussion of storing profiles in separate locations from files, as is recited in the claims. Dourish discloses that the properties are equivalent to "tags" that have "a name and a value" (Column 9, lines 50-56). For example, a tag may be "author=dourish" that is "presented within the content and/or property read/write path of a computer system" (Column 10, lines 30-34). In contrast, a "profile," as recited in claim 1, "specifies parameters associated with a previous instance of the file used by the software application for at least the purpose of preparing the software application to display the file upon its retrieval by the software application."

For example, Dourish discloses that "attaching [an] active property 155 to [a] document 110 forms an association between the property and the document," and that "the association is independent of content type, the application format used to generate the document, and other characteristics of the document 110" (Column 14, lines 5-10). Thus, the "tags" of Dourish are not equivalent to a "profile" as recited in the claim, as Dourish clearly states that properties are independent of an application format used to generate a document.

For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the Dourish reference, and request an allowance of the claim.

Independent Claims 8 and 15

Independent claims 8 and 15 recited elements similar to those recited in claim 1, including:

"a plurality of storage media that are selectively used by the processor to store the application specific profiles separately from the files" (claim 8), and

"storing the file and the associated profile to separate storage locations in the computer system" (claim 15).

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 8 and 15 are likewise patentable over the Dourish reference, and applicants respectfully request their allowance.

Conclusion

Overall, the cited reference does not teach or suggest the features recited in independent claims 1, 8 or 15, and thus the claims are allowable. Since these claims are allowable based on at least the above reasons, the claims which depend from them are likewise allowable. If the undersigned representative has overlooked a relevant teaching in the reference, the Examiner is requested to point out specifically where such teaching may be found.

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-3090.

Applicant encloses payment the extension of time fee, and believes no additional fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 606928002US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael J. Smith/  
Michael J. Smith  
Registration No.: 56,702  
PERKINS COIE LLP/  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)  
Attorneys for Applicant